

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **19 September 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-27. Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the subject matter is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hermann (EPO Pub No EP1024626A1, hereinafter "Hermann").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-9 were rejected because the subject matter is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to clarify that the present invention presents important subject matter information to an enrolled user of a situation notification device responsive to verification by the system. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0119] to [0126] of the instant application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected as being anticipated by Hermann. Applicant respectfully points out that Hermann is directed to establishing a secure session between devices to provide cryptographic means to prevent an eavesdropper from **learning the contents of the messages** between the devices (see Hermann, paragraphs [0047]-[0054]).

In contrast, the present invention provides a technique, which allows a registered user to ensure that received **subject matter is genuine** and originates from an authorized source (see FIG. 12 and paragraphs [0119]-[0126] of the instant application). This is beneficial because it allows the registered user to depend upon, for example, the contents of an alert message from an emergency operations center. Note that the subject matter may be sent without being encrypted depending upon the contents of the message. There is nothing within Hermann, either explicit or implicit,

which suggests providing a technique, which allows a registered user to ensure that received subject matter is genuine and originates from an authorized source.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to clarify that the present invention provides a technique, which allows a registered user to ensure that received subject matter is genuine and originates from an authorized source. These amendments find support in FIG. 12 and in paragraphs [0119]-[0126] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-9, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-18, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20-27, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler

Registration No. 47,615

Date: 1 November 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com